Jak d'

TARLTON LAW LIBRARY
TARLTON LAW LIBRARY

## TRANSCRIPT OF RECORD

## Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1952 1953

No. 101 2

HARRY BRIGGS, JR., ET AL., APPELLANTS,

vs

R. W. ELLIOTT, CHAIRMAN, J. D. CARSON, ET AL., MEMBERS OF BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF SCHOOL DISTRICT No. 22, CLARENDON COUNTY, S. C., ET AL.

APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

FILED JUNE 3, 1952

Probable jurisdiction noted June 9, 1952

### SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER TERM, 1951

## No. 101

HARRY BRIGGS, JR., ET AL., APPELLANTS,

vs.

R. W. ELLIOTT, CHAIRMAN, J. D. CARSON, ET AL., MEMBERS OF BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF SCHOOL DISTRICT No. 22, CLARENDON COUNTY, S. C., ET AL.

APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

#### INDEX

	Original	Print
Record from U.S.D.C. for the Eastern District of South		
Carolina, Charleston Division	1	1
Caption (omitted in print	ing)	
Complaint	2	1
Answer	14	12
Exhibit "A"—Petition of plaintiffs dated Novem-		
ber 11, 1949 to the Board of Trustees, etc	21	18
Exhibit "B"—Decision of the Board	27	23
Transcript of testimony at trial, May 28-29, 1951	37	30
Caption	37	30
Appearances	37	30
Colloquy between court and counsel	38	30
Opening statement on behalf of plaintiff	45	35

Judd & Detweiler (Inc.), Printers, Washington, D. C., July 10, 1952.

ii

### INDEX

Record from U.S.D.C. for the Eastern District of South Carolina, Charleston Division—Continued		
Colloquy between court and counsel—Continued	Original	Print
Testimony of L. B. McCord	48	37
R. W. Elliott		43
Matthew J. Whitehead	62	47
Harold McNalley	99	70
Ellis O'. Knox	106	75
Kenneth Clark		82
James L. Hupp	138	97
Louis Kesselmann	144	101
E. R. Crow	151	105
H. B. Betchman	173	120
Devid Krech	192	132
Mrs. Helen Trager	198	136
Colloquy between court and counsel	217	148
Testimony of Dr. Robert Redfield from the case		
of Sweatt vs. Painter et al	230	156
Reporter's certificate (omitted in printing)		
Opinion, Parker, C. J., filed June 23, 1951		176
Dissenting opinion, Waring, J		190
Decree		209
Appeal papers on first appeal (omitted in printing)	360	
Report of defendants pursuant to decree dated June		
21, 1951	438	211
Appendix A-Architect's drawing of proposed		
addition of Scotts Branch Schools	451	222
Appendix B-Amended building survey and re-		
port of the Summerton area schools, December	N.	
1951		223
Appendix C-Statistical synopsis of the immediate		
and ultimate results of the construction and re-		
modeling program of School District No. 1		235
Appendix D-November 1951 issue of "The		
Eagle", student body publication of Scott's	i	
Branch High School	472	239
Order transmitting defendants' report to United		
States Supreme Court		255
Per curiam opinion of Supreme Court, dated January		
28, 1952		256
Plaintiffs' motion for judgment	491	258
Order setting date of second hearing for February 29,		
1952		260
Order continuing hearing until March 3, 1952		261
Clerk's note re letter of John J. Parker, etc		261
Letter of John J. Parker, February 9, 1952 to Judges	(	
Waring and Timmerman and reply of Judge War-		
ing (omitted in printing)		
Motion that R. W. Elliott, et al.be made parties to the		0.00
suit, etc.	500	262

INDEX		iii
Record from U.S.D.C. for the Eastern District of South		
Carolina, Charleston Division—Continued	Original	Print
Report of the defendants supplementary to the report		
filed December 20, 1951	503	263
Copy of House Bill No. 2065	507a	268
Letter dated February 15, 1952, E. R. Crow, Di-		
rector of the State Educational Finance Com-		
mission to Governor Byrnes	507b	270
Transcript of hearing March 3, 1952	508	271
Reporter's certificate(omitted in printing)	559	
Opinion, Parker, C. J., filed March 13, 1952	562	301
Decree	568	306
Petition for appeal	570	307
Order allowing appeal	573	309
Citation on appeal(omitted in printing)	576	
Assignment of errors and prayer for reversal.	578	311
Statement required by Rule 12 of the rules of the Su-		
preme Court (omitted in printing)	580	
Praecipe for transcript	660	312
Designation of additional portions of the record to be		
included in transcript	663	314
Clerk's certificate(omitted in printing)	673	
Stipulation as to printing	674	314
Statement of points to be relied upon upon and designation		
of parts of record to be printed	676	315
Order noting probable jurisdiction	678	316

132

DAVID KRECH, Sworn.

Direct examination.

### By Mr. Carter:

Q. Mr. Krech, what is your occupation?

A. I am at present on leave from the University of California as visiting professor of social psychology at Harvard University.

Q. How long have you been associate professor?

A. I have been doing research and teaching psychology since 1933.

Q. What is your educational background? What degrees

do you hold?

A. I have a Master of Arts degree from New York University, a Ph.D. in Psychology from the University of California.

Q. Have you published any books or articles?

A. Quite a number; about 40 scientific articles in psychological journals and three or four books.

[fol. 193] Q. What professional societies do you belong to?
A. I am a fellow of the American Psychological Association, and President of one of the Divisions of the American Psychological Association. I am a member of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, and a member of the American Association of University Professors, and a member of Sigma Xi, the honorary scientific society of the United States.

Q. Now, Mr. Krech, is the examination of legal segregation in education and its effect upon the individual a proper function of a social psychologist?

A. It is one of the most significant problems which social psychologists have dealt with and one of the books that I refer to devotes as many as two chapters to that very problem. It is a problem which has taken the attention of research psychologists, perhaps that one problem more so than any other single problem of our social behavior.

Q. Have you studied the problem?

A. Well, as I pointed out, since I devoted about two chapters of our book, I have spent quite a good deal of time studying that problem.

Q. Now Mr. Krech, assume that segregated public schools are required by law for Negroes, have you formed any opinion as to what effect this situation will have upon the Negro child?

A. Very definite, and if I may say considered opinion.

Q. Will you kindly say what that opinion is and on what

[fol. 194] do you base it?

A. My opinion is that legal segregation of education is probably the single, most important factor to wreak harmful effect on the emotional, physical and financial status of the Negro child, and may I also say, it results in a harmful effect on the white child.

Q. Would you explain in a little more detail this harmful effect that you describe, emotionally, financial and physical.

A. Well, the reason why I make such a statement, and I realize it is a rather strong statement, that in my opinion legal segregation which involves (1) a legal definition of an individual in terms of race, and involves a statement of some of his rights in relation to race, is the most significant factor to promote, encourage and enhance racial prejudice and racial segregation of all kinds. The reason for that psychologically is primarily this: No one, unless he is mentally diseased, no one can long maintain any attitude or belief unless there are some objective supports for that belief. We believe, for example, that there are trees. We would not long continue to believe that there are trees if we never saw a tree. Legal segregation, because it is legal, because it is obvious to everyone, gives what we call in our lingo environmental support for the belief that Negroes are in some way different from and inferior to white people, and that in turn, of course, supports and strengthens beliefs of racial differences, of racial inferiority. I would say [fol. 195] that legal segregation is both an effect, a consequence of racial prejudice, and in turn a cause of continued racial prejudice, and insofar as racial prejudice has these harmful effects on the personality of the individuals, on his ability to earn a livelihood, even on his ability to receive adequate medical attention, I look at legal segregation as an extremely important contributing factor. May I add one more point. Legal segregation of the educational system starts this process of differentiating the Negro from the white at a most crucial age. Children, when they

134

are beginning to form their views of the world, beginning to form their perceptions of people, at that very crucial age they are immediately put into the situation which demands of them, legally, practically, that they see Negroes as somehow of a different group, different being, than whites. For these reasons and many others, I base my statement.

Q. These injuries that you say come from legal segregation, does the child grow out of them? Do you think they will be enduring, or is it merely a sort of temporary thing

that he can shake off?

A. It is my opinion that except in rare cases, a child who has for 10 or 12 years lived in a community where legal segregation is practiced, furthermore, in a community where other beliefs and attitudes support racial discrimination, it is my belief that such a child will probably never recover [fol. 196] from whatever harmful effect racial prejudice and discrimination can wreak.

Q. Mr. Krech, assume another situation, assume that in segregated public schools to which Negroes attend are inferior to white schools, will education in that situation

have any adverse effect on the Negro child?

A. Very definitely. Psychologists have a long time ago given up the notion that what we call intelligence, I. Q., is independent of the education and of the experiences of the individual, and an inadequate education reflects itself, and we have empirical data to substantiate this, reflects itself in a lowered I. Q., in lowered ability to cope with the problems of life. I might point out that I do not hold with some people who suggest the white man, who is prejudiced against the Negro, has no cause to be so prejudiced. I would say that most white people have cause to be prejudiced against the Negro, because the Negro in most cases is indeed inferior to the white man, because the white man has made himself through the practice of legal segregation. There is no psychologist that I know of who would maintain that there is any biological, fundamental difference between the two groups of people, but through the practice of inadequate education, that was a hypothetical situation that you gave me, as a consequence of inadequate education we build into the Negro the very characteristic, not only intellectual, but also personality characteristics, which we then use to justify [fol. 197] prejudice.

#### Cross-examination.

### By Mr. Figg:

- Q. Where were you born?
- A. Poland.
- Q. And at what age did you come to this country?
- A. Three.
- Q. Where did you live when you came here?
- A. New Britain, Connecticut.
- Q. And then where? California?
- A. No. I also lived in New York City, Chicago, Colorado, Pennsylvania,—I taught at those places, and California, and the last year I was visiting professor of social psychology at Oslo University in Norway.
- Q. Have you ever lived in one of the States which has legal segregation?
- A. Only when I was taking my basic training in the United States Army.
  - Q. And what state was that?
  - A. Florida.
- Q. And have you ever made any study on this problem we are discussing in any State which has legal segregation?
  - A. I am sorry I didn't hear the question.
- Q. Have you ever made a study of this problem we have been discussing in a State which has legal segregation? [fol. 198] A practical study.
- A. As a man who is primarily devoted to the science of psychology, I think I am familiar with perhaps every study that has been made in this area. I base my conclusions not on my own studies obviously but on the field of psychology.
- Q. You base your opinion not on your own practical investigation of the problem but on the sum total of the reading which you have done on the study which you have made.
  - A. Reading and research. That is right.
- Q. But no practical research in a State which has legal segregation?
  - A. All research is practical.

Judge Parker: Answer the question.

136

Q. I am talking about, have you? A. I myself, no, I haven't.

MRS. HELEN TRAGER, SWOTN.

Direct Examination.

By Mr. Carter:

Q. Mrs. Trager, what is your occupation?

A. I am a teacher. I am a lecturer at Vassar College in Poughkeepsie, New York, and consultant in curricula at Vassar.

Q. How long have you held this position?

A. Just this year. At the present time I am also a consultant in curriculum and human relation to a special project sponsored by Yale University and the Bureau of [fol. 199] Intercultural Education in the rural schools of Connecticut.

Q. What other teaching experience have you had?

A. I have taught in the elementary school, both public and private. I have been educational consultant to city schools in New York, Philadelphia, Denver, Colorado, San Diego, California, Detroit, Michigan. I have been lecturer and group leader of workshops for teachers and administrators in the field of elementary education and human relations education at Columbia University Teachers College, at the University of Minnesota, at the University of Utah, at New York University, and San Diego College.

Q. Would you describe your educational background

briefly for us?

A. I am a graduate of the New York Training School for Teachers, from which I received a diploma to teach in elementary schools. I have a Bachelor of Science, New York University, and a Master of Arts from the same University.

Q. Have you published any books or articles?

A. Yes, in the last ten years I have published under my own name or with colleagues about twenty manuscripts; about six of them are pamphlets in the general field of democratic education; others are articles on problems of